



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/972,579	10/05/2001	Philip A. Rudland	GB000152	4528
24737	7590	04/07/2004	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			AUVE, GLENN ALLEN	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2111	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/972,579	RUDLAND ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Glenn A. Auve	2111	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-18 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 2,5,8,10,12, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 is rejected based on lack of positive antecedent basis of "said available devices" on lines 4-5. Claim 1 and claim 2 each recite what appear to be different groups of "available devices" and it is not clear if applicant only means the available devices on the second gateway's bus or if reference is being made to all of the available devices on both buses.

Claim 5 is rejected because it is not clear how the bus can be said to maintain a registry of device details. The bus is a set of lines with no inherent intelligence or storage capability, so it is not clear how it could be said to maintain a registry.

Claim 8 is rejected based on lack of positive antecedent basis of "the user interface of the device control module" on line 3.

Claim 10 is rejected because it is not clear what is meant by "in which the proxy isochronous connection being operative to decode received isochronous data transmissions and re-encode the isochronous data for transmission on a remote bus." This claim does not make sense grammatically.

Claim 12 is rejected based on lack of positive antecedent basis of "its bus' respective stream manager" on the last line.

Claim 17 is rejected because it is not clear what is meant by "a connection between devices on a remote bus is represented as an internal connection by a gateway." It is not clear what is meant by "represented" as used here. Represented where and to whom?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 1-10 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hillier et al., PCT Publication WO 01/19032 A1 (provided by applicant).

As per claim 1, Hillier et al. (Hillier) shows a bridging system (40) for a communication system comprising a first gateway (19) and a second gateway (29) arranged to communicate with each other, each gateway being connectable to a different bus (18,28) of the communication system, the first gateway being operative to communicate details of available devices on its respective bus to the second gateway, the second gateway being operative to generate at least one proxy element corresponding to each of said available devices, each proxy element being operative to communicate data and messages between devices on the bus of the second gateway and the device on the first gateway corresponding to the proxy element (at least in pages 2-4 and 6). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 1.

As for claim 2, the argument for claim 1 applies. Hillier also shows that the second gateway is operative to communicate details of available devices on its respective bus to the first gateway, the first gateway being operative to generate at least one proxy element corresponding to each of said available devices, each proxy element being operative to

communicate data and messages between devices on the bus of the first gateway and the device on the second gateway corresponding to the proxy element (fig.1 and pages 2-4 and 6). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 2.

As for claim 3, the argument for claim 1 applies. Hillier also shows that each gateway is controllable so that only selected details of available devices are communicated to the other gateway (page 6, last paragraph). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 3.

As for claim 4, the argument for claim 3 applies. Hillier also shows that each gateway is controllable so that only details of selected available devices are communicated to the other gateway (page 6, last paragraph). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 4.

As for claim 5, the argument for claim 1 applies. Hillier also shows that each bus maintains a registry in which details of devices available on that bus are registered, each gateway being operative to register with the registry to receive new details of devices becoming available on the bus (fig.1, (19) and (29)). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 5.

As for claim 6, the argument for claim 1 applies. Hillier also shows that details of an available device include functional component modules, the generated proxy element comprising a proxy functional component module (pages 6-9 which describe how the system operates in the HAVi environment of which the functional component modules are a part). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 6.

As for claim 7, the argument for claim 1 applies. Hillier also shows that details of an available device include cable plugs, the generated proxy element comprising a proxy cable plug (page 10). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 7.

As for claim 8, the argument for claim 1 applies. Hillier also shows that details of an available device include device control modules, the proxy element comprising the user

interface of the device control module (pages 6-9). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 8.

As for claim 9, the argument for claim 1 applies. Hillier also shows that details of an available device include isochronous data transmissions, the proxy element comprising a proxy isochronous connection (inherent in that IEEE 1394 communication is used which provides for isochronous data transfer). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 9.

As for claim 10, the argument for claim 9 applies. Hillier also shows that the proxy isochronous connection being operative to decode received isochronous data transmissions and re-encode the isochronous data for transmission on a remote bus (inherent in that the system is for transferring data between clusters/gateways to communicate between devices on different IEEE 1394 buses). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 10.

As for claim 13, the argument for claim 1 applies. Hillier also shows that a proxy element comprises code and at least a part of a data table held by a gateway (fig.1 and pages 6-7). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 13.

As for claim 14, the argument for claim 13 applies. Hillier also shows that each proxy element on each bus is assigned a new id (pages 2-3 and 6-7). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 14.

As for claim 15, the argument for claim 14 applies. Hillier also shows that the data table is a routing table mapping the id of the proxy element to the id of the proxied element on the other bus (fig.1 and pages 2-3 and 6-7). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 15.

As for claim 16, the argument for claim 1 applies. Hillier also shows that the first and second gateways are implemented in a single device (fig.1,(40)). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 16.

As for claim 17, the argument for claim 1 applies. Hillier also shows that a connection between devices on a remote bus is represented as an internal connection by a gateway (fig.1). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 17.

As for claim 18, the argument for claim 1 applies. Hillier also shows that the communication system is HAVi compliant (pages 4+). Hillier shows all of the elements recited in claim 18.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited references show other home AV network systems.
6. Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art does not appear to show the claimed limitation that an isochronous data connection is only set up if sufficient resources are available on all busses and gateway connections involved.
7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenn A. Auve whose telephone number is (703) 305-9638. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8:00 AM-5:30 PM, every other Friday off.
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on (703) 305-4815. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2111

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Glenn A. Auve
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2111

gaa
April 2, 2004